these years. At present a middle school, a high school and a college consisting in the aggregate of about 700 pupils were being held in that building. At a time when great importance was attached to the physical culture of girls, it was a pity that in the said institution there was not enough open space for them. To remove this congestion, she suggested that the middle school section which had a strength of about 400 girls should be shifted from the building and located elsewhere.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI replied that the question was under the active consideration of Government.

Mrs. RUKMINIAMMA then referred to collegiate education for girls. She said that as long as the Maharani's College had been affiliated to the Madras University, it had a Science Section attached to it, but the moment the institution came under the control of the Mysore University, the Science section was abolished and Bangalore was made the Science centre. This had caused great inconvenience to girls taking up Science subjects as they had to go to Bangalore for studies. The question of opening a Science section for the Intermediate grade in the Maharani's College had come up for discussion in the Senate, but it was lost for want of one vote. In spite of it she would appeal to the Government that a Science section be opened in the Maharani's College for the Intermediate grade and that a sum of Rs. 20,000 be provided for this purpose in the budget under discussion. She hoped that there would be no opposition to this request from any quarter of at least this House.

Proceeding, she thanked the President for having introduced her to a distinguished visitor as the first lady graduate in South India. She would at the same time request him to consider how much encouragement and support Government should have given her to attain that qualification. Government continued this policy for a long time with the object of encouraging women's education and absorbing women graduates in service, and it was as a result of that policy that she had the good fortune of rising to be the Head of the Maharani's College. Except for a short period in 1913 when there was a European Superintendent, all along Mysore lady graduates were placed in charge of the institution. It was nearly 6 years since she had retired and both her successors were, though not Mysoreans, Indians. But she was surprised that the Government should have departed from this wholesome policy and imported a foreigner to that post by granting her over-seas allowance, personal allowance and so on, ignoring the claims of Mysoreans. She wondered whether qualified ladies fit to hold the post of Superintendent of the College were not available in Mysore, or, at any rate, in India.

The PRESIDENT observed that it was considered desirable that in that institution English should be taught by one whose mother-tongue was English. For this reason the European lady was appointed and in the best interests of the institution.

Mrs. RUKMINIAMMA said that, if that was the only object, the European lady could have been appointed as a Professor and not as Superintendent.

The PRESIDENT said that it was desirable that she should, in addition to teaching English, be placed in administrative charge of the institution.

In conclusion, **Mrs. RUKMINIAMMA** appealed to the Government to encourage local women by appointing them to responsible posts.

Mrs. W. H. THEOBALD represented that when she visited Chikmagalur, she had come to know that for want of water facilities in the Maternity Hospital there, great difficulty was being experienced and requested that adequate provision be made in the budget to supply this want.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) said that the question was under active consideration.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS—*concld.*

IV. General Principles of the Mysore Public Parks Bill—*concld.*

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH said that the bill was not necessary for the present

and so without wasting the time of the House in discussing the pros and cons of the measure, he would request the Government to take it back. After hearing the reply of the Government to his request, he would, if necessary, discuss the merits and demerits of the proposed legislation.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari) observed that from the discussions which had taken place on the measure so far, it was evident that there was a misapprehension in the minds of the members that this measure had been brought up with the object of prohibiting meetings in the parks and for this reason, they were suggesting that the measure should be taken back. He would assure the members that that was not at all the object of the Government and would request them not to entertain any such fear. It was purely a measure intended to protect the plants and trees in the gardens by regulating and controlling the use of parks by people resorting to them. He, however, added that with a view to set at rest any doubts in the minds of the members on this point, Government would be prepared to delete sub-clause 4 (2) (*b*) of the measure which prohibited the holding of public meetings, demonstrations or picnic parties in the parks. With the deletion of this sub-clause, the law would be similar to that in other places and he hoped that the House would accept it.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA said that though he did not dispute the statement made by one of the members that the Lal Bagh was first laid out during the days of Tippu Sultan, yet he had no hesitation in saying that great credit was due to the Dewan for its present excellent condition. Every one, rich and poor, was enjoying its beauty. Therefore while he was prepared to support the Government in any action they proposed to take in order to protect the trees, plants, lawns and flowerbeds there, he would request them not to impose any restrictions on the people by levying fees from them, etc. He was of opinion that the rules in force at present were sufficient not only to protect the plants and trees in the gardens but also to regulate and control meetings or picnics therein. As such, the proposed measure was unnecessary, especially as there was strong opposition to it in the House. He therefore urged Government to withdraw the measure as was suggested by Mr. Malliah.

Mr. G. MALLANNA also requested the Government to take back the measure as it aimed at arming the Government with unduly large powers.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY said that the introduction of the proposed measure might be deferred for the present.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that even under sub-clause 4 (2) (*a*), considerable hardship would be caused to the people, for admission would be regulated by the levy of the prescribed fee. He was of opinion that these restrictions also should be removed for the House to accept the measure.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI observed that, even under the existing rules, Government had similar powers and nothing new had been proposed in the measure under discussion.

Mr. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that Government had not enforced such rules so far. If, under the existing rules, Government had the power to regulate admission of persons by levy of fees, there was no necessity for them to have recourse to fresh legislation. But if such powers did not already exist, it was wrong to arm themselves with such wide powers as contemplated in the bill. The watchmen would have large powers under this measure and this was a matter which required to be seriously considered by the House.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI said that the watchmen were expected to discharge their duties just as police constables in maintaining law and order, and nothing more.

Mr. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that the Government would do well not to press the bill as, even in its modified form, it was not acceptable to the House.

Rao Sahib M. RAMASWAMI said that beautiful lawns were being laid out, plants from various countries had been obtained at great cost and plenty of

money was being spent on their maintenance. There was no doubt that all this was for the benefit of the public. So it was necessary that the public should co-operate with the Government in preserving these plants, etc. For this purpose, whatever action Government proposed to take, would be acceptable to him. But there were provisions in the bill which empowered the Government to declare any bit of land with a few plants thereon as a park and impose undue restrictions on the public. If such provisions were deleted and the measure was restricted to the extent of safeguarding the gardens, he would have no objection to support it.

Mr. T. S. ALI KHAN said that members ought not to be afraid of the introduction of the proposed measure. Government were not aiming at making any profit out of this legislation. Nor would they prevent the holding of meetings in the parks for its own sake. On the other hand, it was intended to prevent any annoyance or discomfort that might be caused by some people to some others resorting to gardens. If there was no law of this kind, there was a likelihood of petty quarrels taking place in the gardens. For example, meetings might be held there ; or while some people were enjoying the radio, some others might bring some non-vegetarian food and have a picnic by their side and thus cause discomfort to them. To prevent such incidents, the Superintendent of Gardens should be invested with certain powers. For these reasons, he requested the members not to reject the bill summarily.

As regards the statement made by Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar that the watchmen would be in a position to exercise large powers if this measure was passed, he said that, if it was so, the proper course for the House would be to request the Government to modify or, if necessary, even to delete such clauses of the bill with a view to curtailing such powers, but not to throw out the measure altogether.

Mr. M. MADIAH said that for recreation of people, parks were necessary and every one without any distinction must have free access to these places. During the Dasara and the Birthday Festivities, many people from villages would be going to Mysore and they should have full freedom to see and enjoy the beauty of these parks. He feared that the introduction of the proposed measure would take away such freedom and prevent them from resorting to these beauty spots. For these reasons, he requested the Government to withdraw the measure.

Mr. G. RAJAGOPALACHAR said that ordinarily the incidents referred to by Mr. Ali Khan would not happen and even if they happened, it was best to leave the matter to adjust itself by each party exercising a spirit of toleration. As such, the speaker did not find any need for the measure just then.

Replying on behalf of Government, **Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI** assured the House that the Government had not proposed the measure with a view to causing any kind of trouble or inconvenience to the public making use of these gardens. On the other hand, it was intended to maintain the parks in an efficient condition in the interests of the general public and had been brought forward as a result of the request made by the Superintendent, Government Gardens. As had already been stated by him, Government would delete sub-clause 4 (2) (*b*). If even with that modification the House was not prepared to accept it and wanted it to be postponed, Government would have no objection to withdraw the bill for the time being and bring it forward again in a modified form some time later.

The bill was withdrawn by the Government.

V. General Principles of the Mysore Cigarette Tobacco Safeguarding Bill.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (**Mr. M. Venkatanaranappa**) explained the general principles of the bill as follows:—

"The Virginia type of tobacco used for the manufacture of cigarettes has commenced to be grown and cured in Mysore and its cultivation is gradually spreading. It is a variety of tobacco

which has bright future prospects in Mysore. In the interests of the safe expansion of cultivation of this variety of tobacco and to check the spread of insect pests and plant diseases which are likely to cause heavy damage to the crop and thus permanently injure the prospects of its future expansion, it is proposed in this bill to regulate the raising of seed-beds for supply of seedlings to the growers and the construction of curing barns by the issue of licences. It is equally necessary to safeguard the interests of the growers by fixing the minimum price to be paid by curers, like the Mysore Tobacco Company, to the growers. The bill also provides for the destruction of plants infested with pests or diseases to prevent the spread of pests or diseases. Where tobacco is to be sold in grades and not as ungraded, the bill indicates the standards of the grades to be adopted for purposes of marketing. The standard for each grade as adopted in the bill is the same as that adopted by the Government of India in their Agricultural Produce Marketing Rules relating to tobacco.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA enquired what would be the extent of land under the management of the Tobacco Company. He feared that if the company monopolised the entire industry, the raiyats would have no chances of taking to tobacco cultivation and deriving any benefit from it.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that it would not be possible just then to fix the actual extent of land under the company's management. But whatever the extent, cultivation would have to be done by the raiyats, and the company would provide for curing and grading arrangements.

The PRESIDENT observed that this was an industry which was likely to bring nearly 40 to 50 lakhs of rupees into the pockets of the raiyats in the State in the course of 4 or 5 years and it was therefore necessary that the industry should be protected and directed on efficient lines. Otherwise, it would not be possible to expect full price for the produce.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY enquired whether there was any truth in the statement that tobacco cultivation would sap the land of its fertility.

The DIRECTOR of AGRICULTURE (Mr. T. G. Rama Iyer) replied that there was no basis for such an apprehension.

Thereupon **Mr. L. VEMA REDDY** expressed the gratitude of the raiyats to the Government for encouraging a paying industry like tobacco cultivation at a time when the prices of food crops had fallen and the raiyats were experiencing great hardship even to pay the *kandayam*. At the same time, he suspected that as a result of the licensing system, rich and influential people alone might get licences much to the detriment of the poorer raiyats.

Mr. Patel MALLAPPA enquired whether the legislation would apply even to the cultivation of the ordinary variety of tobacco.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied in the negative.

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA explained that as this was a special variety of tobacco intended for the manufacture of cigarettes, some kind of control and protection by Government was considered necessary. That was why provision for the destruction of diseased plants had been made in the bill lest the infection should spread.

Rao Sahib M. RAMASWAMI enquired whether destruction of affected plants would be done without consulting the raiyats concerned.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU said that it was necessary that the raiyats should co-operate with the Government in the destruction of the plants infested with pests. If they failed to do so, Government would have to take the initiative and destory the plants with a view to preventing the spread of the disease to other plants. Even under the Insects and Pests Act, Government had power to enter into private lands and destroy diseased plants. Similar provision was included in the bill under discussion and nothing more. However, this law would not apply to country tobacco.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH said that from the Kannada copy of the statement of general principles placed into the

hands of the members, it looked as though the proposed measure would apply to all kinds of tobacco.

Mr. T. G. RAMA IYER made it clear that it applied only to cigarette-tobacco which included the following varieties, *viz.*, Harrison Special, Cash, Adcock, Burley and all other flue-cured varieties of tobacco used for the manufacture of cigarettes and not to other varieties. And if the Kannada version did not convey this meaning, it required to be made explicit.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA said that Mr. Venkatanaranappa had explained in great detail the advantages of the proposed measure, and Mr. T. G. Rama Iyer had cleared the doubts entertained by certain members. There were many raiyats without any occupation and this industry was sure to give them ample scope to eke out a living. For this reason, he thanked the Government for having encouraged this industry and thus found a way to help the raiyats. He hoped that the entire House would accord its support to the measure.

Mr. GURUSWAMI GOWDA said that the previous speaker, being a shareholder in the newly started Tobacco Company, Ltd., had expressed his views as a shareholder. As one interested purely in the tobacco cultivation, the speaker held a different view altogether. In 1926 when a European started a similar concern in Whitefield, he used to purchase green tobacco from the raiyats at the rate of 11 pies per pound. This year, the rate had been considerably reduced and it varied from 3 to 6 pies per pound. The number of barns had increased to 5 near Hoskote. The company was wasting much more money on working expenses than private men, whereas the latter were managing their own barns and were paying much better rates to the raiyats. Such being the case, it was desirable to encourage the raiyats to put up barns.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU said that raiyats would be given all possible facilities for having their own barns. Government were even prepared to give loans to raiyats for this purpose.

Mr. GURUSWAMI GOWDA said that personally he did not think there was any necessity for legislation of the kind under discussion. It looked to him that the Government had introduced it solely for giving a fillip to the Tobacco Company which was showing signs of progress. Of late, the raiyats had given up even their ragi cultivation and had taken to tobacco cultivation hoping to make some money out of it. At such a time and even before the industry had begun to thrive, he felt that Government should not interfere with it in the manner they had proposed to do.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU explained that there was no kind of interference at all on the part of the Government as alleged by the previous speaker and that the law had been proposed in the best interests of the industry itself.

Mr. GURUSWAMI GOWDA proceeding, complained that as a result of introducing the system of licensing, some difficulty was being experienced by the people. Some time back, when some persons from Cantonment wanted to put up barns at Hoskote, permission was refused.

At this stage, the House adjourned for lunch and reassembled at 3-30 p.m.

Mr. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO said that too many restrictions were sought to be placed on the growers of tobacco. According to clause 5 of the proposed measure, it shall not be lawful for any person to carry on the business of raising seed-beds or the construction of curing barns except under the authority and subject to the terms and conditions of licence granted.

Clause 4 contemplated two kinds of licences, one for raising seed-beds for supply of seedlings and the other for the construction of barns for curing. While he conceded that licensing was necessary in the case of the latter, because it was a technical process requiring great care, skill and scientific application, he did not think that licence was equally necessary for raising mere seed-beds.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that in fact the raising of seed-beds was most important being the initial stage in the process of cultivation of tobacco.

Mr. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO feared that by the restrictions imposed in raising seed-beds, the supply of seedlings would be monopolised by the licensees. If the seeds obtained were themselves not good in quality, he said that the entire crop was liable to be infected, because the tobacco borer was conveyed not merely through the land but also through the seed. If therefore the crops were infected, it was but reasonable that the grower should be indemnified for the loss. But no provision had been made in the bill to indemnify him in such circumstances. The speaker therefore thought that clause 4 required to be amended so as to guarantee the indemnity. To obviate, however, this indemnity, he would suggest that the Entomologist and other trained men of the department should go round, examine and inspect the seed-beds, as was being done in the case of sugar-cane cultivation, and also ensure that the seedlings raised were disease-free so that the growers might have the confidence that they would not suffer any loss.

Mr. T. G. RAMA IYER replied that the tobacco borer laid eggs on the leaf on which pests were formed and so it was wrong to assume that the borer was conveyed through the seed.

Mr. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO pointed out that so long as there was no guarantee that the seedlings supplied were disease-free, it was necessary that the grower should be indemnified for the loss. Otherwise the department should certify that the seed-beds were unaffected and the seedlings raised were good in quality

He then said that where the crop was infected and it was considered desirable to destroy it, such destruction should be made only in the presence of the concerned cultivators and not after its removal from his presence, because it was likely that an unwary purchaser might go in for it later presuming that the entire crop might not have been infected.

The speaker then pointed out that in clause 12 a slight verbal change was required. He thought that the meaning would be made clear if the word 'assumed' was substituted for the word 'resumed'.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that it would be looked into.

Mr. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO then said that clause 15 also was somewhat vague. It had been stated therein that the offence under the Act shall not be triable by a court inferior to that of a Magistrate of the first class. He wanted it to be made clear that the Magistrate trying the offence would be one having local jurisdiction.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU said that the speaker might confine himself to the general principles of the measure without going into its details, which would be gone into by the select committee.

Mr. B. SITHARAMIAH said that where tobacco grown by a private grower caught infection from the Government farm near by, it was reasonable to compensate the private grower for the loss of his crop and to this end, he requested that provision be made in the bill.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA asked what the diseases were that usually affected tobacco and which of them were dangerous.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that the Director of Agriculture would give the necessary information on the point later on.

Proceeding, **Mr. CHANNABASAPPA** said that it seemed to him that the Government brought forward the measure with two objects in view: first, that cultivation must progress and the raiyats must be benefited by the industry and secondly, that the spread of the diseases must be checked and the raiyats enabled to earn large profits. To secure these objects, the Government contemplated licensing both the raising of seed-beds for the supply of good seedlings and the construction of barns for curing. While he agreed that both the objects were good and laudable in their own way, he thought that the provisions of the law were such that they tended to affect, either directly or indirectly, the interests of the raiyats.

For instance, in regard to raising seed-beds, the authority empowered to sanction the licence for it was the local government official. It was within his

discretion to grant the licence or not to a person seeking it. It might no doubt be said that only those technically qualified and having the experience of the cultivation and the control measures would be given licences. But, so long as the grant of licence was discretionary on the part of the concerned government official and thus the power of patronage being vested in him, personal equations were bound to influence his decision to grant the licence. This was a defect which, the speaker thought, required to be remedied. Secondly, the licensee might get a *mutchalika* executed from a grower on stiff terms, but it might so happen that the former might not supply the seedlings in time and all the same insist on the terms of the *mutchalika* being fulfilled.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU pointed out that licensing involved no financial commitments.

Mr. CHANNABASAPPA, while agreeing with the above view, thought that some agreement before-hand was necessary between the licensee and the grower in regard to the timely supply of seedlings. Because, for some reason or other, if the licensee did not supply the seedlings in time to the grower, the fit stage for planting would pass away and in such cases, it was necessary to compensate the grower, especially when *mutchalika* had been got executed from him by the licensee. This aspect of the question, he said, required to be examined.

Then, even the barn owner might get *mutchalikas* executed from the suppliers of tobacco in regard to supply. It might so happen that the barn owner might refuse to purchase the produce on the alleged ground that it was not good in quality, that it contained some specks here and there and that it was not disease-free, and on this score might offer only very low prices. No responsible officer of the Government or the department would be on the spot at that time. If the suppliers wanted to complain to the authorities concerned about the situation, they must go all along to the headquarters of the authorities. But that would be of no use to the raiyat because, if within about 6 hours after reaping the tobacco was not put to the process of curing, it would become useless and no one would purchase it even if it was given free of cost. Under such circumstances, the suppliers would be at the mercy of the barn owner who could dictate his own prices for the commodity. Such things had happened in the case of sugar-cane supply to the Sugar Company. The speaker therefore prayed that this defect also should be remedied.

Then, according to clause 13, any one contravening the provisions of the law was liable to punishment which might extend to Rs. 500 or in case of continued contravention, with a fine of Rs. 50 per day of such continued contravention. The speaker thought that the punishment was too heavy.

Then again, supposing at the stage of raising seed-beds or planting, there was infection. Whether the nature of the disease was such as to affect the entire crop if left unchecked or whether the infection would be only localised, were matters on which there could be honest differences of opinion between the authorities concerned and the growers. But the Director of Agriculture or any officer deputed by him, notwithstanding this honest difference of opinion, might order the destruction of the crop. Their decision being final, as stated in the measure, there was no go for the growers except to submit to it. The speaker was therefore of the opinion that the authority vested with the power to order the destruction of crop should not also be the authority to decide on the point.

Mr. N. MADHVA RAU replied that Government might notify the diseases under the Act and might order the treatment or removal or destruction of the crops according as the circumstances warranted. As regards the penalty being heavy, he pointed out that the same provision existed even under the existing Pests Act. As regards the other points raised, he said that the Director of Agriculture would explain them.

Mr. T. G. RAMA IYER said that the varieties of tobacco locally grown were ಬಾಳೆಪಚ್ಚೆ, ಕತ್ತೆ ಕಿವಿ, ಆನೆ ಕಿವಿ, etc. The Virginia variety of tobacco had its home in America. After long and continued

experiments, that variety had been acclimatized to the Indian soil. This variety of tobacco was being grown for a special purpose, namely, for the manufacture of mild cigarettes. It was not useful for any other purpose. Therefore, before growing it, it must be considered what the demand for it was and the benefit from growing it.

In 1930 the imports of cigarette tobacco to India were 5 million pounds in the form of leaf and an equal quantity in the form of cigarettes. But in 1935 the extent of imports both in the form of leaf and cigarettes went down considerably, the former to 3 million pounds and the latter to less than a million pounds. The reason for the fall in the imports was that variety of tobacco began to be grown in India itself. As many as 50,000 acres of land had been brought under that cultivation in Guntur. There were other places also in India where this variety of tobacco was being grown. It was therefore necessary to see that there was no over-production, since that would create unhealthy competition in the local market which might result in killing the industry itself. In fact, the fate of jute industry was still fresh in the minds of the people. As the Virginia variety was grown for a special purpose, as had been mentioned above, and production in India itself had increased, there was not much margin for consumption in the internal market, with the result that a market outside India had perforce to be sought for sale of the quantity grown locally. And happily, there was a considerable margin for consumption in the international market. The Virginia tobacco was grown mostly in the United States of America, the other three countries namely Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Canada coming next. Every year as much as 810 million pounds of tobacco were grown in the United States of America; half of it they exported to other countries; and as much as 220 million pounds of leaf were sent to the United Kingdom alone. This country was the largest importer of cigarette leaf. The Empire countries exporting Virginia leaf were Canada, Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and India. Southern Rhodesia exported about 14 million pounds to the United Kingdom, Nyasaland about 13 million pounds; Canada about 10 million pounds and India about 13 million pounds. In 1936, out of 272 million pounds of leaves required by the United Kingdom, only 50 million pounds were supplied by the Empire countries put together. The Imperial Economic Committee consisting of the representatives of Great Britain, the Colonies and the Dominions and Ind a, submitted a report in 1937, explaining the position and prospects of the cultivation and the production of the cigarette leaf in all the Empire countries. Since preference was given to all the Empire countries by levy of a preferential tariff, the Empire countries had taken to the cultivation of tobacco in right earnest. There was a very large margin of demand in the United Kingdom to be met by the Empire countries. But, it must be noted that, at the same time, it was a most discriminating market about the quality of tobacco. It was very particular about the grades and standards. The speaker said that in this connection it would be worth while to note the opinion of the Imperial Economic Committee in regard to this subject. They had said that in the last two years a small portion of the cigarette leaf grown in India was sufficiently good in texture, and mild and neutral in flavour to be used in the manufacture of cigarettes in the United Kingdom when blended with other leaf. They had, at the same time, given due caution also. They had said that they would remind other countries contemplating entry into the United Kingdom market that though small trial samples might receive favourable comment, and substantial fiscal preference was very alluring, ability to supply regularly leaf possessing the characteristics of flavour and texture required by the United Kingdom market was essential, if disappointment was to be avoided and even perhaps damage to the trade of those countries which were now building up the reputation of Empire leaf. So, the only market that India could look to for consumption was the

United Kingdom market, because India had also been given fiscal preference, whereas the non-Empire countries had not such preference. So, the most essential condition for a market for our tobacco was that the quality must be good. It had therefore become imperative to take necessary precaution to see that only good quality tobacco was grown.

Proceeding, the speaker said that regulated and controlled tobacco cultivation was possible in the Empire countries because of the legislative control they had in regard to cultivation. In Canada, the Flue-cured Tobacco Marketing Association of Ontario chartered under the legislation, controlled the production and marketing of flue-cured tobacco. Southern Rhodesia also had imposed a substantial measure of control over both production and export of tobacco. In Nyasaland, an institution, consisting of the representatives of buyers and growers and government, had been set up by ordinance for regulating the growing, marketing and exporting of tobacco. Thus, whereas every one of the Empire countries seeking a place in the United Kingdom market for their tobacco, regulated production and quality by legislation, India alone had no such controlling measure.

One of the objections of the previous speakers was why restrictions must be introduced in respect of cigarette tobacco in Mysore while they were not obtaining in Guntur. That point had already been answered by the Government of India Marketing Officer himself. He had stated that in the absence of a law controlling the quality of exported tobacco and also in the absence of grading, Guntur tobacco had not been getting the value which it deserved and that "if India is to get her due share in the international market, it is very essential to take up the development and control work in all aspects, from the seed to the processed leaf ready for export or manufacture. During the past few years, the Virginia cigarette leaf produced in India, mostly in Guntur District, had been of as good a quality as those produced in other parts of the Empire and yet the average price of the Indian leaf sold in the United Kingdom market had been far below the level of prices of leaf imported from other sources. The main defect with the Indian leaf was that in the absence of standard grades, the quality exported was so uncertain that the English buyer felt compelled to quote lower prices to safeguard himself against the risk of getting bad leaf in a consignment." The Guntur leaf fetched about 8 *d.* per pound in the English market as against 16 *d.* and 15 *d.* respectively, which leaf from Canada and United States of America fetched. So, while growing tobacco in India, it must be remembered that the quality must be such as to find a sale in the London market; because, if the quality was not good, it was sure to be returned, when, the cost incurred in consigning it back to India would have also to be borne by us. So there could be no promiscuous production of cigarette tobacco like sugar-cane or ragi which were meant only for the local market. Tobacco was an article of luxury, had not much consumption in the local market and therefore the quality to be sent to the foreign market must be good in order that it may find a ready sale there.

The speaker then explained why restriction should be placed on the raiyats against growing cigarette tobacco as they liked. He pointed out that from the initial stages of raising seed-beds, every precaution should be taken. All plant breeders in tobacco knew that quality varied with soil and environment. Seeds imported from Virginia did not keep up the same quality if grown for generations in India. Pure seed had to be imported and only a limited number of Indian generations of the parent seed could be permitted. On account of the loss of quality due to gradual deterioration, of seed from generation to generation, it was thought necessary to regulate the source of supply of seed for Mysore tobacco-growers because quality was most important.

Then came the process of rearing nurseries. This was no less important than the raising of seed. In fact it was as difficult to attend to this process as

attending on a patient. The beds had to be kept moist but not wet. In 6 or 7 days after the seed was sown it germinated. Till then it must be covered by paddy straw. And within 24 hours from the time of germinating, the straw must be removed; else, the tiny seedling would come away with the straw. This was the first difficult stage. If this stage was passed through successfully, Bordeaux mixture must be sprayed to it to prevent it from being affected by fungoid diseases. Even in administering the mixture there were different stages; first, a mild solution of the mixture had to be given and then the strength had to be increased gradually. That was the stage at which the plant was likely to be affected by the borer. To prevent the ravage of the borer, arsenate had to be sprayed. Experience showed that even after treating it with arsenate, borers remained. By the time all this was done, 6 weeks elapsed and the seedling would have grown to a height of 6 inches. Seedlings over that age were considered as too old. It would be evident therefore that the process of rearing nurseries was rather a very difficult one.

Rainfall was uncertain as regards time and quality. Therefore if 10 acres of land were to be planted, the grower must raise enough seedlings for 50 to 60 acres. And only the seedlings which were six weeks old when there was sufficient rainfall for transplanting could be used, the rest being cast off. It was not possible therefore for any one and every one to undertake this cultivation. That was why licensing was thought of for rearing nurseries. Unless such control was taken, the growers themselves stood to suffer later on.

Then, while the cost of seedlings generally was Re. 1 per 1,000 before the season, it may go up to Rs. 6 during the season. It was then the time for the nursery-man to dictate his own terms. To avoid this also, licensing was thought of.

Then again, even curing was a difficult process, consisting of 3 different stages, at each of which continued observation and careful watching had to be done so as to get the particular grades or standards. Hence curing also was a skilled profession. He asked whether all this task was possible for an ordinary raiyat to undertake.

With reference to the suggestion of some members that a minimum price for green leaves must be fixed, the speaker said that it was with that purpose in view that a price-fixing committee was proposed to be appointed by Government under the enabling section provided therefor. The price fixed by the committee would have to be paid whoever be the curer, whether the Tobacco Company or any private curer.

With reference to an objection by some speaker why seed-beds should be entirely destroyed if anywhere there was a slight infection by pests, the speaker said that within a short time diseases spread over the entire seed-bed and therefore if timely action was not taken to destroy the affected seedlings, the entire crop would be affected. It was to prevent the entire crop being affected, that power was sought to be taken to order the destruction of crops. Besides, it was only in cases of most dangerous diseases that wholesale destruction would be ordered. The department had no pleasure to destroy the entire crop unless there were sufficient reasons for doing so. And, after all, such a timely step would be in the interest of the growers themselves.

Some member had asked what guarantee there was about the soundness of the seeds supplied. It was in order to produce good seed that it was proposed to license the raising of seed-beds. Firstly, there would be definite information as to who were all that had taken to the cultivation. Secondly, departmental supervision would be facilitated in their work of spraying, etc. Thirdly, unless the department had control, it was not possible for them to inspect any land to see whether the seedlings raised were healthy or diseased.

Some other member had asked what diseases attacked tobacco. There were any number of such diseases, some of which were damping off white mould, frog-eye, mosaic, etc. Of these, mosaic was the most dangerous disease.

In conclusion, he said that from the foregoing it was evident that cigarette-

tobacco cultivation was not a thing that could be undertaken by all and sundry, and to ensure good quality, licensing and other restrictions were thought of. He hoped that this explanation would satisfy the members.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that the Director of Agriculture had explained the position so lucidly in regard to tobacco cultivation that although it looked that there could possibly be no objection to the proposed measure, yet certain members wished to submit what they rightly felt in the matter. The object of the measure was no doubt to put more money into the pockets of raiyats. But how far that object would be fulfilled in the practical working of the measure was to be considered. In the first place, so long as the power to grant licence vested in Government officials and it was discretionary on their part to grant the licence or not, personal equations were bound to influence their decision.

Secondly, as none except the licensees could raise the seed-beds according to the proposed measure, the monopoly of supply would be held by the licensee, so much so that growers of tobacco would be at the mercy of the suppliers of seedlings and whatever the price demanded by the latter would have to be paid by the growers. Such a monopoly, he thought, was against the interest of the growers. He would rather that the grower was given a free hand in the matter of purchasing the seedlings from any supplier. If there was competition in supply, the purchaser would go in for the best variety wherever it was available. And such competition was healthy.

Thirdly, the speaker asked what guarantee there was that only good seedlings would be supplied. He was sure that even the Director of Agriculture could not give such guarantee. This was yet another reason why licence was not to be insisted upon.

Besides, there were the officers of the department to give the technical advice in the process of growing if that was considered necessary. If such advice was not available at any given time, and if bad seedlings were put on the market, the growers would never go in for them. If, however, unknowingly they purchased them for the first time, they would never go in for them a second time.

No doubt there were many difficulties in growing tobacco as was evident from the explanation of the Director of Agriculture. But it would be well if the difficulties were faced by the raiyats themselves. In this view also he did not think that licensing was necessary.

Even in regard to construction of the barns, it was not necessary to license it. Knowledge was not the sole monopoly of a few. If private curers went wrong in the process of curing, they could correct themselves by their own mistakes and by gradual experience. On the other hand, if restrictions were sought to be placed at every stage of growing, there was scope for demoralisation. Instances of such demoralisation in the past were not wanting.

Proceeding, he said that it seemed to him that the granting of licence also would be more or less arbitrary. So the opposers of the bill had no desire to vest such arbitrary powers in the Government. He added that the members had come to entertain, rightly or wrongly, some suspicion and that it would be well therefore for the Government not to proceed with the measure on the present occasion.

Moreover, as tobacco cultivation was yet in an experimental stage, no absolute protection could be given from the infection of diseases.

Mr. T. G. RAMA IYER replied that it was in order to do spraying whenever disease infected seed-beds, that control was sought to be taken.

Mr. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that the same spraying could as well be attended to even without taking the control contemplated. At any time the officers of the department were welcome to inspect the spot, give their advice and do spraying if considered necessary. Nobody would refuse such help.

Proceeding, he said that the analogy of legislative control in western countries on the growing of tobacco did not hold good to Mysore, because the

governments of those countries were responsible to the people and if anything went wrong, the people exerted pressure and brought round the situation. But that state of affairs did not exist in Mysore yet. For the foregoing reasons as also for the reason that many members of the House had not seen the detailed provisions of such an important measure, he appealed to the Government that they be pleased to withdraw the measure for the present. He had no objection to its being brought before the House at the Dasara Session. By so postponing, he thought that Government would only be enabling the members to offer constructive suggestions. Even at present, one such suggestion he could offer and that was, as in the case of traffic control, the Government might appoint a mixed committee comprising Government officers and representatives of tobacco growers and vest in them the power to grant licences.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that such suggestions were welcome even at present.

Mr. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that as had already been stated by him, the members were not in a position, in the absence of the bill, to give due consideration to the details of the measure and therefore he would once again appeal that the measure be taken up at the Dasara Session. If, however, the Government wanted to press it to a division, he was sorry to state that he and his party would have to oppose it.

Mr. G. MALLANNA felt sorry that the opposers had not appreciated the laudable object with which the Government had introduced the measure. Evidently, it showed that none of them were aware of the difference between ordinary tobacco and the special variety of cigarette tobacco. So great were the difficulties in growing the special variety of tobacco that it was impossible for ordinary raiyats to undertake it. In fact this was a new industry. The Director of Agriculture had graphically explained the difficulties in regard to it as a result of which every one, he hoped, had felt convinced about the need for legislation to control the cultivation of good quality tobacco. It was therefore not wise to oppose the measure on mere sentimental grounds. He was sure that the measure would help the raiyats, because if anything went wrong in safeguarding the interests of the raiyats, he was sure that the members of the Assembly who had opportunity to put questions, move resolutions and make representations, would bring to the notice of Government the grievances and see that they were set right. Therefore, before experiencing how the law worked in practice, he thought that the members should not oppose the measure for its own sake. If that was their attitude, he thought that the same members might oppose the measure even at the Dasara Session. The cultivation of this variety of tobacco was new to Mysore. It had bright prospects before it. The measures proposed to be taken were in the interests of the safe expansion of the cultivation. There was no obvious relation, according to him, between responsible government and the proposed measure. For these reasons, he hoped that the House would not vote against the measure.

Mr. KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHIB in further supporting the measure said that he was a grower of tobacco in large quantities and as such he could be credited with having practical experience of its cultivation. He endorsed every word of the explanation given by the Director in reference to the extreme care and caution to be bestowed for growing good quality tobacco. Notwithstanding these difficulties, if the members should oppose the measure, it only went to show that they were doing it without any justifiable reason. It seemed to him that some members had opposed the measure due to some misapprehensions; some others had opposed it for the sake of mere opposition, holding the view that they should oppose every measure, however good it be, until responsible government was established; and still some others opposed it in order to create discomfiture to the Government The speaker was surprised that even after the elaborate explanation by the Director there should still be opposition to the measure. He did not understand why the oppositionists should distrust so

much the intentions of the Government. The measure under discussion was a beneficial one inasmuch as it was an attempt to put some money into the pockets of the raiyats. This special variety of tobacco cultivation was new to Mysore. It had only foreign market. That market was very discriminating. It was imperative therefore to see that only the required standard quality of tobacco was grown. Once the quality was assured, he was sure that the raiyats would get good returns. He therefore hoped that the members would support the measure.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH also, in further supporting the measure, said that it was very necessary to have such a measure on the Statute Book. He complimented the Government on having a very good technical expert in the person of Mr. T. G. Rama Iyer as the Head of the Agricultural Department. People had been wondering why he should have been continued so long as a Deputy Commissioner while he was a technical expert. The Director had studied the question very well and had explained to the satisfaction of the members why the measure was necessary. The tobacco grown at present was not graded and hence it was not fetching good returns. To improve the cultivation and to ensure the graded quality, the bill had been designed. He hoped that the members would support the general principles of the bill. If there were at all any defects in the working of the law or in the wording of the Act, he thought they could be set right later.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH observed that, from the discussions on the measure, it seemed to him that only two main reasons must have prompted the oppositionists to speak against the measure. One was the fear that small cultivators were unnecessarily restricted in growing tobacco and the other was the apprehension that no adequate price was guaranteed to the growers. He said that he did not agree to the first reason. He was of opinion that where tobacco was grown there must be barns constructed side by side so that small cultivators might get their tobacco cured immediately. There was no use in having barns outside the zone and at distant places, because tobacco grown was liable to become useless unless it was put to the process of curing within a definite time. As regards the other apprehension, however, that adequate price was not guaranteed, he said that he too had to share that fear. Guaranteeing a minimum price was very important. In fact the suppliers of sugar-cane to the factory had suffered very much in the beginning owing to want of proper prices for cane supplied by them. With that experience behind, it was but natural for the members to entertain similar apprehensions with regard to the price payable by the curer. For this reason he requested the Government to see that in the price fixing committee proposed to be appointed, representatives of growers also were included and that the price fixed by the committee was made binding on the curer. If that much was guaranteed, he had no doubt that many members would support the measure.

He then requested the Government to provide sufficient safeguards in the rules with a view to obviating the difficulties complained of by the previous speakers in the matter of supply of seedlings to the cultivators on favourable terms. He also requested the Government to sanction loans wherever the raiyats came forward to undertake cultivation.

With regard to apprehensions felt by Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar that until responsible government was established, members could not be sure that Government would keep up to their promise that the interests of raiyats would be safeguarded, the speaker said that there was no obvious relation between the form of government and the present measure. He thought that Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar must himself have seen how the Government had been responsive to public opinion. For these reasons, he hoped that the measure would be supported by the whole House.

Mr. Shampur PAPANNA said that the elaborate explanation of the Director could not but convince anybody with an open mind that the cultivation

of the particular variety of tobacco was impossible to be undertaken by ordinary raiyats.

With reference to the remarks of Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar that no restrictions must be imposed on growing tobacco and that everybody might be permitted to grow as he liked, the departmental officers giving the necessary advice and assistance to the growers in the matter of eradicating the pest, etc., the speaker said that it was no doubt a good suggestion. But he asked how the department could know who were all the persons who had taken to such cultivation and how they could inspect the fields and do spraying work unless they had control in the matter. That was why control was sought to be taken in order to see that the particular grade of tobacco was grown to satisfy the foreign market. Also, it was necessary to see that there was no promiscuous production in the interest of the industry itself. Instances were not wanting in the past to show how unhealthy competition had told upon power-loom industry. For these reasons, he was of opinion that control measures were necessary. He hoped that the bill would be passed by the House.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replying to the discussions on the bill said that the Director of Agriculture having explained all the details connected with the question of tobacco cultivation and the necessity to control it, he would refer only to a few objections raised in the House.

From the speeches made so far on the measure, it seemed to him that the general opinion of the House was in favour of control of production with a view to securing the graded quality required for consumption in the international market. Those who had opposed the measure seemed to have entertained some misapprehensions as regards licensing. They feared that there would be partiality in the grant of licences and that only rich and influential men stood the chance of getting licences. The speaker did not know why they should entertain such a misapprehension at all. In fact there could be no question of exercising patronage at the time of granting licences. The only considerations that would weigh most with the authorities before granting the licence were whether the raiyats would at all be benefited by undertaking this difficult cultivation, whether they had the ability and the means to undertake the cultivation and also whether there was likely to be any unhealthy competition among them. Excepting these, he said that no other factors would influence their decision to grant licences.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA pointed out that it was the local officers who were the final authorities to grant licence and not the Government.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that local officers also had a sense of responsibility and they could be trusted to grant the licences properly. Besides, if mistakes were ever committed in the grant of licences, the members of the Assembly had always the opportunity of bringing the matter to the notice of the Government.

Proceeding, the speaker said that the cigarette tobacco cultivation was so difficult and costly that he could straightway state that it was beyond the means of poor raiyats to undertake the cultivation. While previously the cost of raising seed-beds was as much as Rs. 750 per acre, it had now decreased to Rs. 400, but nevertheless the fact remained that it was prohibitive. Besides, as the particular variety could not be had locally, but had to be imported from America at considerable expense, it was particularly necessary to see that the raising of seed-beds was controlled in order that good seedlings alone sprung up. He quite agreed with Mr. Malliah that where seed-beds were raised, there must inevitably be curing barns.

The next point was whether a minimum price could be guaranteed to the growers He pointed out that it was also the object of the measure to provide in the rules a minimum price to the grower of his product. It was the intention of the Government to appoint a committee comprising of representatives of private growers, barn owners and a few disinterested Government

officers to go into the question of fixing the prices. But the speaker pointed out that the constitution of such a committee was a matter that could be provided for in the rules to be framed for the working of this measure.

With reference to the appeal of a member that the measure be postponed to the Dasara Session to enable the members to study it in detail and offer constructive suggestions, the speaker said that there was no need for such postponement as there could be no difference of opinion, especially after the explanation by the Director, on the general principles of the bill. The bill was intended to control tobacco cultivation so as to ensure a good quality for the foreign market and the detailed provisions might be gone into by the select committee, where necessary changes could be made to safeguard the interest of the raiyats. As it was purely a business measure, he hoped that the House would not be led away by political considerations, but agree to the general principles placed before it.

The general principles of the bill were thereupon put to vote and passed, 90 voting for and 80 against.

The House then rose for the day to meet again at 12 of the clock the following day.

Sixth Day.

Thursday, 16th June 1938.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Thursday, 16th June 1938, at 12 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.

Before the proceedings of the day commenced, **Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA** requested the President to convey to His Highness the Maharaja his grateful thanks for the presentation of a pair of Cashmere shawls so graciously made to him by His Highness. He said by this gracious act, His Highness the Maharaja had not merely honoured the speaker but the Yadava community as a whole. He prayed to God Almighty that in His bountiful mercy, He might grant long life, happiness and prosperity to His Highness the Maharaja, His Highness the Yuvaraja, Prince Jayachamarajendra Wodeyar and his consort and the other members of the royal family.

Mr. A. DASAPPA also expressed his thanks on behalf of the Jyotinagara Vysya community.

The PRESIDENT thanked the members for the very kind sentiments expressed by them.

At this stage, **Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR** represented that when the Cigarette Tobacco Safeguarding Bill was put to vote the previous evening, it was announced that 90 were *in favour* and 80 *against* the measure, and that there was some difference of opinion about that count. He desired to ask for a re-count then and there, but did not do so as the House was anxious to disperse.

The PRESIDENT replied that the counting as announced was correct.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR said that according to the counting by his party, the votes were 92 *for* and 110 *against*. However he was not asking for a re-count, but his request to the President was that after the counting was over and the result announced, there must be a chance afforded for any member to ask for a re-count if he desired to do so.

The PRESIDENT observed that he did not expect there would be need for such a request. He would, however, note the suggestion made by the member.